

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 234 967

RC 014 358

AUTHOR Gladhart, Peter Michael; Britten, Patricia
TITLE The Impact of Rapid Population Growth on Housing,
Public Service Needs and Citizen Priorities in a
Rural Community. Research Report 366.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Agricultural
Experiment Station.
PUB DATE Oct 78
NOTE 21p.
AVAILABLE FROM Michigan State University, Bulletin Office, P. O. Box
231 East Lansing, MI 48824 (\$.55 each).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Community Attitudes; *Community
Change; *Community Characteristics; Community
Services; Community Study; Environmental Education;
Expenditures; *Housing; Individual Characteristics;
Migration Patterns; *Needs Assessment; Older Adults;
*Population Growth; Residential Patterns; *Rural
Areas; Rural Environment; Urban to Rural Migration
IDENTIFIERS *Impact; Michigan (Clare County); Second Homes

ABSTRACT

A rural township in one of the fastest growing counties in northern Michigan was selected as a prototype for changes in small rural communities experiencing rapid population growth due to immigration. In 1973, 180 permanent residents and 58 seasonal homeowners in Hayes Township completed questionnaires covering household composition; family income/employment; patterns of seasonal residence; housing (type, age, size, financing expenditures); home improvement investments; housing conditions of seasonal homes; residential mobility of permanent residents; satisfaction with housing, neighborhood, and community; community contact/participation; and impacts of immigration on attitudes and values of residents. Only 10.5% of permanent residents surveyed were born in the county; they were younger than the rest of the sample, and had more formal education, higher incomes, and a more rural background than the immigrants. Half of the household heads surveyed were of retirement age, requiring a different mix of community services; they found it harder to pay taxes to support needed services. Two-thirds of permanent residents had made major improvements in their homes since purchasing them, much of this by converting seasonal homes to permanent homes. Attitudes and policy preferences of natives, immigrants, and seasonal residents did not suggest that immigration drastically changed the community's value and attitude mix. (MH).

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

31.821

366

FROM THE MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION EAST LANSING

TECHNICAL Information

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are indebted to George McQueen and Clare Brown of the Cooperative Extension Service in Clare Co. who indicated the need for this research and provided assistance and support in field collection. Ms. Elizabeth Mowery-Daly helped design and carry out the study as well as implement findings through Community Resource Development programs. Roy Spangler, Extension Manpower Agent; Hayes Township Supervisor, Harley Tuttle; and Clare Co. Commissioner, Harold Stammon; provided assistance in understanding the Hayes Township community. Thanks are due graduate research assistants Brent Armstrong and Michael Lawrence who collected data for preliminary analysis. Lewis Pompey helped with the initial write-up. Pattie Schrauben and Roxanne Graham typed several drafts of this report.

The Impact of Rapid Population Growth on Housing, Public Service Needs and Citizen Priorities in a Rural Community

by
Peter Michael Gladhart and Patricia Britten
Department of Family Ecology

INTRODUCTION

The rural-urban migration stream which characterized the U. S. during the first half of this century has changed. Two movements now dominate in the nation: (1) between urban communities, and (2) to a residential area farther from the center city than the previous residence. Low property values in the countryside seem to attract or retain low-income families seeking low cost housing; at the same time, the availability of land for development attracts middle-income persons wanting to escape city living conditions.

A national study of residential preferences showed living in rural areas and small towns is preferred (4). However, most respondents interviewed desired a rural or small town location within commuting distance of a large city.

The growth of Michigan counties since 1960 reflects these census patterns. Average growth for the 12 urban fringe counties was 33.2%, and 8.3% between 1970 and 1975. The corresponding growth rates for the 11 counties containing a central city of a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area were 7% (1960-1970) and 1.3% (1970-1975). Non-metropolitan counties in Southern Lower Michigan grew at a rate of 12% between 1960 and 1970; non-metropolitan counties in the Northern Lower Peninsula grew by 17%. Between 1970 and 1975, these areas grew at average rates of 7 and 17%, respectively (8).

An explanation for recent movement to rural areas in Michigan may be a desire to secure some "open space" before the supply is exhausted. The effects of this flow reversal are evident in many Michigan rural non-metropolitan counties, particularly in Northern Lower Michigan.

Ten northern counties showed a population growth rate of 23 to 50% as a result of net immigration

rates of 19 to 36% (2,3). Population dispersal of new residents into small unincorporated places and open country sites was evidence of the growth (9). The 1970 Census of Housing reported that from 9 to 30% of the housing in these counties was substandard. Many northern non-metropolitan counties have experienced high immigration by the elderly (3). Results of a case study of elderly migrants to Clare Co. will be published soon (5).

The striking changes in the life and landscape of local communities produced by these population shifts concerned long-term residents and community officials. The changing priorities and lifestyles of the local population attributed to the influx of households with more urban orientations and expectations were viewed with ambivalence and distaste. New people have brought changing land use patterns as former farm and recreational uses shift to seasonal and permanent residency. Demands for housing, social services and basic community sustenance: water and sewer systems, roads, utilities and schools have increased abruptly in these communities. However, many communities, constrained by an inadequate and static revenue base, cannot meet these demands for increased quality and quantity of public services.

OBJECTIVES

This study was developed to document the impact of rapid population growth on a rural township in one of the fastest growing counties in Northern Michigan. Hayes Township in Clare Co. was selected as a prototype of what was happening in many other communities growing at slower, but similarly high rates. Furthermore, officials in this township demonstrated a willingness to understand the community changes and to provide information on which to base township policies and service improvements.

Township officials and older residents were concerned because: 1) new people were bringing new values and attitudes to the community that could radically alter its present social climate; and 2) they needed to know citizen priorities for public service improvements in view of low township revenues and high levels of need for improved roads, police protection and health care services.

This study was based on the hypothesis that numerous immigrants resided in substandard, formerly seasonal homes, living under seriously deficient housing conditions. This hypothesis was supported by census reports indicating 29% of the housing in Clare Co. was substandard and from knowledgeable county administrators. Substantiation of this hypothesis would have serious implication for policymakers in rural communities.

We also wished to document the changing composition of the township population to discover the factors responsible for the immigrants' choice of a new residence and community, and to inventory their perceptions and priorities for future community change and growth. The data presented detailed results of an extensive survey of both seasonal and permanent community residents during late summer and fall of 1973.

DESCRIPTION

Clare Co.

Clare Co. is centrally located in Michigan's Lower Peninsula, within a 2-hr drive of six major population centers. The state's major north-south highway bisects the county. The county's 16 townships absorbed a net in-migration rate of 34% and an overall population increase of 43% (5,048 persons) during the intercensal decade, 1960 to 1970. About 11% of the 1970 population was over age 65. Some 25% of all households had incomes of \$3,000 or less; the average annual unemployment rate in 1972 was 18%, and 29% of all housing units are classified as substandard. The county seat of Harrison, located in Hayes Township, grew from 606 to 1,942 persons, a 220% increase over the decade (6).

From a topographical standpoint, Northern Lower Michigan begins about 10 mi south of Harrison. Driving north on the highway the scenery changes suddenly from relatively flat, open agricultural land to a rolling wood landscape. Thousands of vacationing people drive each year in search of rest and relaxation via this route. Thus, Harrison is the first vacation and recreation center encountered in "Northern Michigan." The road from the highway to Harrison (about 5 mi) is dotted with motels, real estate offices and small businesses. Rolling hills and small lakes in Hayes Township sur-

round the town and a full facility state park is located on the city limits.

Numerous vacation subdivisions surround the five major lakes in Hayes Township. The physical character of these developments varies greatly from lake to lake and sometimes between certain developments on a single lake. But dirt roads, overcrowding and minimal sanitation facilities, are common in most developments. The township lacks municipal sewage and water service.

Hayes Township and Clare Co. Compared

Much of the growth in Clare Co. was in Hayes Township between 1960 and 1970. The March 1970, Census showed that 70% of the people in Hayes Township had moved to their place of residence within the past 5 yr (10). This contrasts with 59% of the persons in Harrison and 55% in Clare Co. as a whole. We can illustrate the recent mobility by looking at the figures another way. In 1970, 45% of the persons in Clare Co. had lived in their present residence for 6 yr or more, 41% of the persons in Harrison had 6 yr tenure; while only 30% of the persons in Hayes Township had lived in their present house that long. Hayes Township thus shows considerably more resident instability over recent years than does Harrison or Clare Co. as a whole.

Table 1 illustrates in-migration specifically by showing the place of residence in 1965. Note that 53% of the 1970 Hayes Township population lived in a different county or state in 1965. The county-wide figure for persons with an out-of-county residence in 1965 is much lower; and Harrison shows even more stability — only 23% of its 1970 population had out-of-county residence in 1965. Thus, of 4,203 persons in Clare Co. in 1970 who lived out-of-county in 1965, 851 or 20% settled in Hayes Township. While the rate of mobility into Hayes Township from areas outside the county was quite high, the rate of in-county mobility to Hayes Township is low compared to the city of Harrison. This suggests people already settled in the county more often move to Harrison, perhaps to be closer to the services provided in town, and that Hayes Township attracts a larger portion of the people coming to the area from outside the county.

The increase in Hayes Township population corresponds to an increase in available housing. Table 2 shows the rate of housing construction for Hayes Township and Harrison. Notice the high rate of home building in the township since 1960, particularly 1960 to 1964 when 1,191 new units were built. During this same period, only 105 new houses were built in Harrison. Following this building boom, the population of the township (and the city) rapidly increased. About 23% of the 1970 population moved into their house in 1965 and 1966.

TABLE 1 — Persons 5 yr old and older in 1970 by residence, 1965

	Hayes		Harrison		Clare Co.	
	Persons	%	Persons	%	Persons	%
Same house	526	33	642	49	7710	50
Different house (same co.)	126	08	250	20	2410	16
Different co. (same state)	823	51	243	19	3811	25
Different state	28	02	50	04	392	02
Moved, res. in '65 not reported	112	07	108	08	981	06
Total	1616	101(a)	1293	100	15,304	99(a)

(a) Columns may not total 100 due to rounding.

Source: Table 28 of Fourth Count Population Summary (11).

TABLE 2. Count of occupied and vacant year-round housing units by year unit built

	Hayes		Harrison	
	Units	%	Units	%
1969-70	50	02	43	05
1965-68	309	14	97	11
1960-64	1191	55	105	12
1950-59	318	15	211	23
1940-49	239	11	142	15
1939 or earlier	73	03	313	34
Total	2180	100	911	100

Source: Table 8 of Fourth Count Housing Summary (10).

Census figures also suggest that during the building boom years, more than 85% of the new houses constructed in Hayes Township cost less than \$15,000. This implies that readily available low cost housing was a major factor in the dramatic township growth from 1965 to 1966. While this is a reasonable assumption, high cost home construction during the same period indicates other factors also influenced township immigration. The same factors that stimulated high cost construction were likely related to the low cost housing boom and subsequent township growth.

In Harrison, the building boom years (1960-1964) produced more expensive houses — 85% were valued at \$15,000 to \$35,000. These more substantial homes and closeness to city services may have influenced growth in Harrison while Hayes Township was attracting people for possible other reasons.

According to the 1970 census income and family-type distributions were similar for Hayes Township, Harrison and Clare Co. Male-headed families ranged from 73 to 76% and female-headed families from 7 to 10% (Table 3).

TABLE 3. Families by family income, 1970

Income class	%		Clare Co.
	Hayes Township	Harrison	
under 3,000	25	19	18
3,000 to 6,999	28	31	27
7,000 to 9,999	24	20	22
10,000 and over	22	28	31
Total	99(a)	98(a)	99(a)

(a) Columns may not total 100 due to rounding.

Source: Table 75 of the Fourth Count Population Summary (11).

The plumbing facilities of houses in Hayes Township, Harrison and Clare Co. are illustrated in Table 4. Relatively few "occupied" houses lack some or all plumbing compared with the number of units in the "year-round occupied plus vacant" category ("seasonal" homes are included in this category). In both categories, Hayes Township had considerably more houses lacking some facilities.

TABLE 4. Plumbing facilities in year-round housing units of Hayes Township and Harrison, 1970

Total units	Occupied units		Occupied plus vacant for occasional use	
	Hayes 604	Harrison 478	Hayes 2190	Harrison 911
A: With all plumbing facilities	51	99	40	57
B: Lacking some or all facilities	19	1	61	13
C: Lacking flush toilets	17	1	54	5
D: Lacking bathtub or shower	19	1	55	12

Source: Tables 12, 46 and 47 of the Fourth Count Housing Summary (10).

The preliminary and final reports of the housing census only describe "year-round" housing; there is no distinction between occupied and vacant. Therefore, the quality of housing enjoyed by permanent occupants

appeared much lower than was really the case. The 29% substandard housing reported in Clare Co. reflects this total. Since the figure incorporates all housing "potentially" occupiable, housing conditions for families appear worse than what they are.

Study Sample

Identifying an adequate sampling frame was a major problem in Hayes Township. Surveys in rural areas often employ sections as the primary sampling unit in a cluster design. All households in the randomly selected sections are enumerated, then a fraction of these are interviewed. However, this did not seem feasible in a township with more than 5,000 property descriptions. The variation in number of households per section makes this a poor choice for a cluster sample. Similarly, sub-divisions were too varied in size and number of properties for use as clusters.

The solution was to stratify the township into subdivided and non-subdivided property. Property descriptions in subdivisions obtained from the 1971 tax roles provided the sample frame for the first strata. However, only 600 families were listed as permanent residents in 1970. Therefore, many subdivision lots would be seasonal residence properties. Our goal was to achieve 200 completed questionnaires — one fourth of them seasonal residents and the balance permanent residents. To insure the desired sample size, subdivision properties were further stratified based on the owner's mailing address. All Harrison or Hayes Township addresses were assumed to be permanent residents and sampled at the rate of 1 in 3. Property owners with a non-Harrison address were assumed to be seasonal residents and sampled at the rate of 1 in 5. Since the tax roles did not indicate whether or not a structure was present, we assumed properties assessed at the minimum lot value for vacant land had no structure and these were dropped from the list. Every third permanent and every fifth seasonal residence in each subdivision was randomly selected to be interviewed. An attempt was made to interview all households in unsubdivided township properties. Using township maps, interviewers drove through the area to compile a list of occupied residences.

Completed questionnaires were obtained from 180 permanent residents and 58 questionnaires from seasonal homeowners. The permanent resident questionnaire represented 56% of the eligible sample. Others could not be contacted by the interviewer in three attempts to call back at designated addresses.¹

Preliminary comparisons of the sample data with 1970 census figures indicated the sample over-repre-

sented households of retirement ages and under-represented younger households with both husband and wife working. Thus, the permanent sample was weighed to give the same household-type distribution as in the 1970 census before final projections were made concerning total township population. We assumed that the population composition did not change between 1970 and 1973, as this seemed the most conservative option available.

Seasonal residents were those who lived in Hayes Township for part of the year but claimed a permanent residence elsewhere. The seasonal sample was drawn from residents residing there only part of the year and available for interview between Aug. 15 and Oct. 30, 1973. The reported frequencies are based on 58 interviews.

PROCEDURES AND RESULTS

Family Characteristics

Household Composition

Permanent resident households with male heads constituted 92% of the sample, 8% were headed by females. Usually, the respondent at the interview was not the household head, since 81% of the respondents were female. Most seasonal residents interviewed had a male household head. Ninety-four percent of the families had a male head, with a wife also present; an additional 2% had a male head with no wife; 4% of the families were female-headed households. Most interviews were conducted with women, however. About three-quarters of the respondents were female and one-fourth were male. Table 5 illustrates family size for households surveyed.

TABLE 5. Distribution of family size, Hayes Township, 1973

	Permanent residents	Seasonal residents
One and two persons	47	33
Three and four persons	31	23
Five to nine persons	22	44
Total	100	100

At the time of the survey about 73% of the permanent households had between two and four members. Single person households comprised 5% and 22% had five to nine members. During the interview less than 1% reported non-family members in their household.

The number of seasonal family members ranged from 1 to 13. The mean family size was 4.4, but many families (28.4%) had two members (the mode). Only

¹ Interviewers were required to make callbacks at different times of the day and week. At least one callback was always on a weekend or an evening.

20% of the families had more than six members. No one in the sample listed residents in their households other than immediate family members.

Table 6 shows that 62% of permanent resident household heads were 45 yr or older at the time of the survey. Only 13% of the household heads surveyed were under 30 yr.

TABLE 6. Age of household head of permanent residents, Hayes Township, 1973

Age	%
Under 25	6.1
25 to 29	6.7
30 to 34	8.6
35 to 44	16.4
45 to 64	46.0
65 to 70	10.3
71 and over	5.7
Not reported	.2
Total	100.0

The survey of permanent Hayes Township residents revealed that 97% of the household heads were born in the U.S. In addition, 75% of those surveyed were born in Michigan. However, only 10% of the household heads sampled were born in Clare Co.

Respondents indicated they had diverse backgrounds. Only 18% spent their childhood in Northern Michigan — 82% were from elsewhere. Many spent their childhoods in rural areas, but many others were reared in large cities (Table 7).

TABLE 7. Place respondent spent most of childhood, Hayes Township, 1973

Type of place	Permanent residents	%	Seasonal residents
Rural country	37		35
Village, small town	20		18
Small or medium city	11		14
Suburb	11		2
Large city	21		31
Total	100		100

For comparison, only 7% of the elderly migrants to Clare Co. were born in the county and of the remainder only 62% were born in Michigan (5). Only 26 to 29% of that group reported living in a village, small town or smaller place between the time of their birth and the completion of school (5). Table 7 shows 57% of the permanent residents in Hayes Township spent most of their childhood in the open country or in a village or small town.

Respondents were asked to report the educational level of the household head. Over half did not complete high school. At the time of the interviews, only 50 household heads (6% of the sample) were attending school. Table 8 shows the distribution of educational achievement for permanent residents.

TABLE 8. Educational attainment of permanent resident household heads, Hayes Township, 1973

Yr completed	%
Less than 8	11.4
8th grade; trade school	11.1
8 to 11	28.7
High school graduation	33.2
Some college	3.6
AA, RN with no BS	4.1
BA, BS	4.6
Above BA	1.4
No information	1.8
Total	100.0

Income and Employment

Income and employment are important indicators of the economic health of a given population. The results of survey questions dealing with family income are presented in Tables 9 and 10 and in Table 36.

TABLE 9. Family income, Hayes Township, 1973

Income class	Permanent residents	%	Seasonal residents
\$0 to \$2999	12.0		2.1
\$3000 to \$4999	17.1		6.3
\$5000 to \$6999	7.9		8.7
\$7000 to \$9999	19.1		10.8
\$10,000 to \$14,999	15.7		26.5
\$15,000 to \$24,999	9.0		30.2
\$25,000 and up	.3		5.8
No information	18.9		10.3
Total	100.0		100.0

TABLE 10. Sources of family income other than wages or salaries, Hayes Township, 1973

Income source	Permanent residents	%	Seasonal residents
Social security	41		18
Pension or annuity	33		23
Unemployment insurance	11		10
Interests or dividends	10		19
Veterans benefits	10		0
Rent income	7		4
Inheritance	4		2
Child support	4		0
AFDC	3		0
Welfare payments	3		0
Workman's compensation	1		5
Other income	2		0

The distribution of families by income class appears in Table 9. Information on the source of income other than wages and salaries is summarized in Table 10. Nearly one-third of the permanent respondents received pension or annuity income while over half received income from Social Security. This proportion of

pension or social security income recipients reflects the large percentage (47%) of retired household heads.

Respondents were asked the following questions about their income. "Probably nobody has more money than he needs, but how would you say you get by on your income? Do you feel very well off, well off, just manage to get by, or do you have to do without necessities?" Over 10% of the permanent respondents said they had to do without necessities and 63% said they "just manage to get by." By contrast, only 2% of the seasonal respondents said they "had to do without necessities" and 52% said they were "well off," compared to 26% of the permanent residents. Detailed responses are given in Table 36.

The survey also revealed that 7% of the employed household heads worked part-time and 7% reported that their job was not steady. In addition, 26% of the permanent residents reported difficulty finding work some time during the 5 yr preceding the interview. However, only 2% of the seasonal respondents reported problems finding employment. Of those having difficulty, virtually all experienced it in the local area. Table 11 illustrates the distribution of this problem among family members for the sample.

TABLE 11. Permanent residents experiencing recent employment difficulties, Hayes Township, 1973

	%
Husband	16
Wife	1
Son	10
No problems	73
Total	100

Respondents offered several reasons for employment difficulties and this information is summarized in Table 12. One-third "stopped looking," one-third "found work in their field," and one-fifth found "part- or full-time work outside their field" (Table 13).

The journey to work for persons in the sample averaged 7.2 mi one-way. Nearly 12% of the household heads residing in Hayes Township worked in the Detroit area.

Occupational classifications of household heads in the township are reported in Table 14. Operatives and craftsmen predominate, followed by professional and technical workers and then service workers. All but about 20% of the household heads would be classified as blue collar workers.

Fifty-seven percent of the employed household heads held their current job 5 yr or less, and 26% for 6 to 10 yr. Only 9% held their current job for more than 13 yr, while 8% were in the 11-15 yr range. The short job tenure reflects migration to the township and depressed labor conditions in the area prior to the study.

TABLE 12. Reasons given by those experiencing employment difficulties, Hayes Township, 1973

	% of those responding
No work at all	29
No work in field	27
Health	24
Seasonal work	5
Age	4
Transportation	2
Lack of skills	1
Other	8
Total	100

TABLE 13. Manner of resolving employment difficulties, Hayes Township, 1973

Category	% of those responding
Found work in field	37
Stopped looking	33
Part-time work outside field	16
Overcame illness	5
Found work outside field	4
Learned new skill	1
No information	4
Total	100

TABLE 14. Occupation of household head of permanent residents, Hayes Township, 1973

Occupational category	%
Professional, technical	8
Managers, administrators	3
Craftsmen	14
Farm managers and workers	1
Clerical workers	2
Sales workers	4
Operatives	12
Service workers	5
Not employed	51
Total	100

Patterns of Seasonal Residence in Hayes Township

Because seasonal respondents spend only part of the year as Hayes Township residents, a series of questions was asked to determine the residence in their seasonal home.

About half of the sample spent some weekends and some entire weeks at their seasonal home. About a third stayed only for "some or most weekends." Only 10% said they usually spend entire months at a time in Hayes Township. Most (about 85%) spent at least some long weekends in their seasonal home. The usual pattern was for the whole family or the husband and wife to go to their Hayes Township home. In less than 10% of the cases did only the wife, husband, or parent plus chil-

dren spend either weekends, weeks, or months at the residence.

Most respondents never considered the Hayes Township home permanent, but about 15% considered it permanent for part of the year. These people usually arrive in June and stay through August or September. In only 9% of the cases did persons not in the immediate family live in the residence when the sample family was not present.

Housing Conditions

Structure Type and Age

Several sections of the Hayes Township survey were devoted to determining housing facilities and characteristics in the study area. Of the permanent resident families, 89% lived in single family homes and 9% in mobile homes. For seasonal residents, those percentages were 95 and 5%, respectively. A high percentage of permanent residents (92%) owned their homes. Only 7% were renters, and an additional 1% said they lived rent-free. All seasonal residents owned their seasonal homes.

The age of homes sampled was evenly distributed, except for a small percentage of houses over 25 yr old. Seasonal homes tend to be slightly older on the average (Table 15).

TABLE 15. Age of dwelling, Hayes Township, 1973

	%	
Yr	Permanent residents	Seasonal residents
5 or less	27	25
6 to 10	30	26
11 to 24	35	37
25 or more	7	12
Not reported	1	0
Total	100	100

Household Facilities

Wells provided water for 99.6% of the permanent households, and for 95.7% the water was piped into the house. Almost as many used a water heater to heat their water. The source of water for seasonal homes was usually a well. Water was piped to about 60% of these houses. About half of the seasonal homes have complete standard heating systems i.e., a central furnace, wall furnace, baseboard or space heat in all rooms. Nearly 28% of the permanent dwellings lack heat in some rooms or use only a stove for warmth (Table 16).

About 25% of the permanent residents surveyed disposed of their own garbage by hauling it to a dump, composting, burying, or burning it. The rest had either

TABLE 16. Method used to heat house, Hayes Township, 1973

	Permanent residents	Seasonal residents
Central furnace	60	40
Wall furnace	9	6
Baseboard heat	2	0
Space heat all rooms	1	3
Space heat some rooms	26	40
Oil, wood stove	2	4
Portable heaters	0	6
Total	100	99

municipal or private garbage pickup. Disposal of human waste was almost entirely by septic tanks or cesspools. Two percent of the sample used outhouses and less than 1% used a municipal sewage system. Of the 98% having flush toilets, 86% had only one, 10% had two, and 4% had more than two. Two percent of the total sample had only a half-bathroom or none at all, while 86% listed one bathroom, 11% listed two, and 1% listed three.

By contrast, the 1970 census figures reported in Table 4 showed 19% of the occupied dwellings in Hayes Township lacked some plumbing, and 17% did not have a flush toilet. This difference may reflect upgrading since 1970, and the possibility that this study missed some substandard housing.

The extent of plumbing and bathing amenities reflects the part-time character of seasonal homes. Although about 62% of the respondents had a flush toilet, only 55% had what they considered at least one full bathroom. The rest stated they had no bathroom or only a half bath. Less than 5% had two bathrooms.

Housing Size and Crowding

The number of rooms in the houses surveyed, excluding kitchens and bathrooms, is listed in Table 17, together with the number of bedrooms for both samples. Both the number of bedrooms used for sleeping and the number of persons per room are often used as indicators of crowding. Housing specialists often regard more than one person per room as "crowded," but the number has little or no theoretical justification (7).

Of the permanent residents 58% used only the bedrooms they had for sleeping; 3% used more than were listed as a bedroom, and 39% had excess bedrooms not regularly used for sleeping. The mean number of persons per room was .82, the median .67. Seventy-eight percent of the sample had one person per room or less. 15% had between 1.0 and 1.5 persons per room and 4% between two and four persons per room. Data were incomplete for 3% of the sample. Crowding is

clearly not a serious housing problem in Hayes Township.

The average number of rooms in the seasonal dwellings was 2.9, excluding kitchen and bathroom. More than 80% had between two and four rooms. The mean number of bedrooms was 1.6, with about 80% having one or two, about 11% indicating none, and about 10% listing three or four. The mean number of rooms regularly used for sleeping was slightly higher (1.8) since in all homes at least one room was slept in whether it was a bedroom or not. One or two rooms were used for sleeping in 84% of the cases; 16% used three or four rooms.

TABLE 17. Size of permanent and seasonal dwellings, Hayes Township, 1973

No.	%			
	Permanent residences		Seasonal residences	
	Rooms(a)	Bedrooms	Rooms(a)	Bedrooms
0	0	0	0	11
1	1	9	11	33
2	3	56	23	47
3	29	27	39	7
4	29	6	20	3
5	20	2	7	0
6-9	18	0	0	0
Total	100	100	100	100

(a) Excluding kitchen and bath.

Several questions asked what appliances were owned by the respondents. Table 18 summarizes the percentage of households owning each appliance.

TABLE 18. Selected housing facilities, Hayes Township, 1973

	Permanent dwellings	%	Seasonal dwellings
Flush toilet	98		62
Septic system	97		62
Water piped to house	96		61
Hotwater heater	94		53
Refrigerator	100		100
Range or oven	99		94
Telephone	87		28
Washing machine	66		14
Separate freezer	50		2

Every household sampled had a refrigerator, and almost everyone had a range and an oven. Less than 10% of the permanent households had no range or oven, and only 6% of the seasonal households lacked these appliances. Bottled gas was used for cooking by 48% of the permanent residents and electricity by 41%. The remaining 11% used piped gas. Only 1% of the sample used wood for cooking fuel. Both permanent and seasonal residents seem to have the same priorities

for household facilities, as these items received identical rankings. However, more than 90% of the seasonal residents reported that only food preservation and cooking facilities are essential; and more than 70% manage without a telephone.

Housing and Finance Expenditures

One section of the survey asked questions about home finances including rent, house payments, taxes and utilities. The mean rent paid by the 7% of the sample who were renters was \$94.90/mo. Monthly rents ranged from \$45 to \$200. An additional 1% of the sample lived rent-free.

Homeowners comprised 93% of the sample. When surveyed, 49% were still paying on their house. Several types of loans were being used to pay for these houses; 50% of those still making payments had a land contract, and 39% had a mortgage. Personal loans, mobile home loans, and combinations were also used.

The median payment for homeowners still making payments was \$85; monthly payments ranged from \$35 to \$583. Most house payments (82%) did not include taxes or insurance. About 2% included taxes, 9% included insurance, and 7% included both.

Utility payments were recorded for both owners and renters. For most, utilities paid included electricity, fuel and garbage removal. The median amount paid per month for electricity was \$14.28; for fuel, \$17.67; and for garbage, \$2.80. The total amount paid for all utilities ranged from \$0 to \$165 with a median of \$35.02, and a mean of \$38.50. A value for total shelter expenditure was computed by combining the amounts paid for rent or house payments, taxes and insurance, and utilities. Table 19 summarizes the total expenditure.

TABLE 19. Total shelter expenditure(a) per month, Hayes Township permanent residents, 1973

Amount paid	%
\$ 0-50	18.1
51-75	11.8
76-100	10.1
101-125	17.3
126-150	6.2
151-200	7.2
over 200	4.6
no information	24.1

(a) Includes rent or mortgage, taxes, insurance and utilities.

To determine the purchase prices of the homes owned, the price of land plus house was computed separately if purchased separately, or together if bought together. Most owners sampled bought their house and land together; 18% bought the land first, and 1% bought the home or mobile home first.

The median cost of land purchased separately was \$1,150, with a range from \$0 to \$13,000. For homes purchased separately, the median cost was \$8,136 with a range from \$0 to \$69,000. The median cost of both land and house when purchased together was \$5,478; housing costs ranged from \$0 to \$27,000.

The homeowners surveyed were also asked to estimate how much they might be able to sell their home for on the present market. The median estimate was \$14,010, with a \$0 to \$200,000 range. Only 10% felt their home was worth under \$5,000, while 25% believed its value to be over \$21,000.

All seasonal residents surveyed in Hayes Township owned their house and land. One-third were making payments on their house, the other two-thirds had totally paid for it. Of those still paying, 55% had a land contract; 25% had a personal loan; 19% had a mortgage; and 1% had a mobile home loan. Monthly payments ranged from \$30 to \$325, with a mean of \$51.84, and a median of \$45. These payments did not include taxes or insurance, which ranged (for all respondents) from \$10 to \$30 with a mean of \$12.86.

Most seasonal residents (82%) bought their house and land together. Eighteen percent bought the land first and less than 1% bought the house first. The mean cost for those purchasing house and land together was \$4,255; the median, \$3,744; and prices ranged from \$1,000 to \$35,000. Half of those buying house and land together made the purchase in 1967 or earlier; about 10% purchased them before 1960. One-fourth of the respondents had purchased their property within 2 yr of the survey.

For those buying house and land separately, the mean cost of the land was \$2,705 (ranging from \$1,000 to \$14,000), and the mean cost of the house was \$6,231 (ranging from \$1,000 to \$14,000). The land had been purchased by half in 1966 or before and the house purchased in 1968 or before. Except for one case, all of the land was purchased between 1953 and 1972, and the houses between 1966 and 1972.

Respondents were asked to estimate how much they could get for their house at the time of the survey if they sold it. Estimates ranged from \$0 to \$100,000, with a mean value of \$12,828 and a median of \$7,682.

Home Improvement Investments

The investment of permanent residents in their homes has substantially upgraded community housing. Fully two-thirds of the sample had made at least one major improvement — the average cost per household was \$5,059. This figure represents only out-of-pocket costs for materials and labor. It understates the value of improvements since many families performed a substantial amount of the work themselves. The total cost

of improvements made by a household ranged from \$35 to \$35,000. The mean expenditure (\$5,059) is somewhat more than one-third of the median reported value of \$14,010 of all homes in the sample. If the median reported value of sample homes is standardized by the median number of rooms, the average cost of housing upgrading was equivalent to the value of 1.5 rooms in the median dwelling.

About 30% of the permanent residents live in a dwelling they first owned as a seasonal home. On the average, the former seasonal residents have spent more than two-and-one-half times as much as other residents in upgrading their homes. The mean total improvement expenditure was \$7,342 for former seasonal residents compared to \$2,769 for other investing families. The upgrading expenditure of former seasonal residents was over half the median value of all homes in the sample; the investment of other residents was only one-fifth this amount. Upgrading was also more commonly reported by former seasonal residents. While one-third of all permanent residents reported no major upgrading expenditure, only 17% of this group first used their homes as a seasonal residence.

The most common improvement was the addition of rooms. Fully 45% of the sample had added a room since purchasing their home. Remodeling was reported by 32%; plumbing, heating or wiring by 27%; and building additions by 21%. The minimum, maximum and mean total expenditures for each home improvement category are presented in Table 20, together with the percent of the sample reporting such an expense.

TABLE 20. Investments in housing improvement by permanent residents, Hayes Township, 1973

Type of improvement	% of sample	minimum \$	maximum \$	mean \$
Addition of rooms	45	100	9,800	3,578.86
Remodeling	32	20	10,999	913.46
Plumbing, heating, wiring	28	45	10,779	1,041.53
Addition of buildings	21	100	10,199	1,001.11
Exterior maintenance	11	100	2,800	527.34
Redecorating	4	35	1,000	589.18
Other additions to property	8	115	3,000	856.22

When asked their home improvement plans for the coming year, about 8% said they expected to add rooms, 8% expected to add buildings and 6% planned to remodel. Respondents were less certain about plans for the next 5 yr beyond 1974. Table 21 outlines improvements planned by permanent residents within 1 yr and within 6 yr.

More than 25% of the residents planned some improvement in the next year. Of those who had made no previous major home improvement, 35% planned to do so within the next year. Twenty-one percent of those who made at least one improvement were also planning

one for the next year. Data suggest that 13 to 14% of the permanent residents planned to add a room, another building or remodel during the 6 yr following the study (Table 21).

TABLE 21. Expected home improvements of permanent residents, Hayes Township, 1973

	Next yr (1974)	% Next 5 yr (1975-1979)	Total
Addition of rooms	8.6	5.3	13.9
Remodeling	6.6	6.5	13.1
Addition of buildings	8.4	4.3	12.7
Redecoration	4.9	2.1	7.0
Exterior maintenance	4.4	1.2	5.6
Plumbing, heating, wiring	2.4	1.1	3.5
Other additions to property	1.0	1.0	2.0
Total planning some improvement	25.5	16.9	42.4

Seasonal respondents were asked to list the changes needed to convert their seasonal residence into a year-round home. The responses are shown in Table 22.

TABLE 22. Changes in seasonal homes necessary for year-round living, Hayes Township, 1973

Type	% who mentioned
Addition of rooms	39
Plumbing, heating, wiring	23
Addition of buildings	6
Remodeling	4
Exterior repair, maintenance	3
Purchase additional land	2
No changes necessary	24

Housing Conditions of Potential Migrants

The typical seasonal home lacks features and facilities essential for year-round occupancy. The substantial expenditures of former seasonal residents in converting their dwellings have been indicated. Responses of seasonal residents intending to migrate provide additional evidence on the probable impact of immigration on family living conditions and the quality of occupied dwellings in the community. Housing conditions of seasonal homes generally show serious deficiencies when considered as permanent dwellings: 70% have three rooms or less, 38% lack a flush toilet and piped water in the house, 47% have no full bathroom. However, the housing of those planning to move to their seasonal home within 5 yr is good by comparison (Table 23). The percentage of homes with serious plumbing or heating deficiencies is only one-half to one-third as great as among all seasonal homes.

By contrast, the seasonal housing of those planning to move to another house in Clare Co. is quite deficient as a year-round residence, more so than for the total

group. The homes are smaller and lack more essential features. It appears that those families planning to move to the country intend to move into good quality housing. Families intending to occupy their present seasonal dwelling generally have a reasonable base to begin with, or they plan an important improvement. It would have been more difficult for families planning to settle elsewhere in Clare Co. to convert their present seasonal dwelling.

TABLE 23. Housing conditions of seasonal residents planning to move to Hayes Township, 1973

% total sample	Plan to move to this house in next 5 yr	All respondents
	11.5	100
Have to add room to live here	71	39
Have to do plumbing, heating or electrical work to live here	14	23
Central furnace/wall furnace	70	46
Have water from a well	96	84
Water is piped to house	79	61
Electric or fuel water heater	79	48
Septic system for human waste	79	62
No flush toilet installed	18	38
Lacks complete bath	18	47
Number rooms excluding kitchen and bath		
2 rooms	4	23
3 rooms	21	39
4 rooms	57	20
5 rooms	18	7

Residential Mobility of Permanent Residents

The average household in the sample had lived in 3.5 (median) residences since its formation. Survey respondents lived in 32 different counties just before moving to their present home. Clare and Wayne Co.'s. each accounted for 15% of the immediate prior residences; Ingham Co. accounted for 8%. An additional 11% of the respondents had lived in Clare Co. since forming a household and had never moved, so they had no prior residence. Table 24 shows the percentage of prior residences for those counties that were the previous residence of 2% or more of the sample. When counties are ranked according to their contribution to the Hayes Township population, the rank is almost identical to that when counties are ranked according to their population. The high ranking of Ingham Co. is due to its greater accessibility to Hayes Township.

All but 3% of the respondents listed Michigan as their previous residence before moving to Clare Co. About 1% came to their present home from Ohio, and less than 1% each from Florida, North Carolina, and Missouri. The median year for moving into the present home was 1970 (Table 25).

Table 26 gives the locations of the permanent dwellings of the seasonal residents. All were located within Michigan and nearly half in the greater Detroit area (Wayne, Oakland, Macomb, Washtenaw Co.'s). Other large cities in the state accounted for many of the rest.

TABLE 24. County of prior residence of Hayes Township permanent residents, 1973(a)

	% of prior residences	1970 county population, in thousands
Clare	14.6	—
Wayne	14.6	2,666
Ingham	7.8	261
Oakland	5.0	908
Macomb	4.3	625
Genesee	4.1	444
Monroe	4.1	118
Jackson	4.0	143
Shiawassee	3.4	63
St. Clair	2.6	120
Midland	2.2	63
Washtenaw	2.0	234
Always Clare (never moved)	10.8	

(a) Counties represented by less than 2% of the sample have been excluded.

TABLE 25. Year permanent residents moved into house, Hayes Township, 1973

Yr.	%	Cumulative %
1973	18.7	18.7
1972	15.5	34.2
1971	12.5	46.7
1970	11.0	57.7
1969	9.6	67.7
1968	6.2	73.5
1965 to 1967	12.9	86.5
1960 to 1964	9.7	96.2
1959 or earlier	3.8	100.0
Not ascertained	.1	100.0
Total	100.0	

TABLE 26. Location of permanent homes of seasonal residents, Hayes Township, 1973

	%
Detroit area	46
Flint area	17
Lansing area	10
Saginaw area	6
Jackson - Battle Creek area	5
Central Michigan	7
Other (in Michigan)	10
Total	101(a)

(a) Total not equal to 100 due to rounding.

About 33% of the sample listed a large city as their permanent residence, 21% listed a small or medium city, and 26% listed a suburb. Only 6% described a permanent residence in a village or small town; 13% described a rural residence.

Few residents surveyed were born in the area, but many had some contact with the area before moving there. Only 25% of those not born in the area claim no prior contact with Clare Co. The types of prior contact respondents listed are shown in Table 27.

TABLE 27. Contact with the area prior to locating in Hayes Township, 1973

Type of contact	Permanent residents	%	Seasonal residents
Visited, vacationed here	36		3
Relative, spouse from area	23		54
Lived here before	6		41
Friends from area	6		2
Born here	5		0
No prior contact	24		0
Total	100		100

Respondents were asked to describe their reason for locating in the community. Many in this sample had close ties with the area. More than one-third of the seasonal respondents indicated the presence of friends or relatives as the reason they chose to locate their seasonal home in the community. Table 28 lists the reasons given by all respondents for locating in Hayes Township.

TABLE 28. Reason for locating in community, Hayes Township, 1973

Reason	Permanent residents	%	Seasonal residents
Location	26		8
Friends, relatives	13		35
Job in area	11		4
Prior contact, business contact	12		4
Get away from city	7		7
Retirement community	6		1
Vacation, recreation	4		34
No reason given	21		6
Total	100		99(a)

(a) Total not equal to 100 due to rounding.

Nearly 75% of the permanent residents planned on staying permanently when they moved into their present house. Another 14% stated that moving depended on the situation, perhaps jobs or children leaving home. The remainder had a definite time period in mind for staying in their residence when they moved in; half of these planned to stay 1 yr or less, the other half, 5 yr or more.

Of the total sample, 82% did not plan on moving within the next year, and 68% did not plan on moving in the next 5 yr. This last percentage is fairly close to the percentage that originally planned to stay permanently. Fourteen percent of the respondents planned to move within the next year; the remaining 3% did not know or did not answer. When asked about the next 5 yr, the number planning to move increased to 25% and the number who did not know rose to 7%.

Satisfaction with Housing and Community

Satisfaction with Housing

Respondents were asked about their satisfaction with their present home, neighborhood and community. One question asked for the reason they were initially attracted to their present house. The reasons given varied, with exterior space or amenities and low cost or availability the most common groupings listed. Interior space or amenities and general quality of the house provided less attraction.

For a few, the house had been in the family or owned by the spouse before marriage. To these people, family ties were more important than any feature of the house or lot. Another group built their house themselves or had it built, so they were unable to define any features that attracted them to it. Most respondents (72%) would prefer to live in their present home rather than move; 24% would prefer to move, and 4% did not know or did not answer.

Many seasonal residents were initially attracted to their seasonal home because they liked the space or land around it rather than something within the actual house. The features which attracted all respondents to their homes are shown in Table 29.

TABLE 29. Initial attraction to house, Hayes Township, 1973

Reason given	Permanent residents	%	Seasonal residents
Exterior space	19		16
Availability	18		19
Exterior amenities	17		30
Low costs	15		12
Built home	8		—
Interior space	6		4
Location	5		—
Family ties	3		—
Interior amenities	2		4
General quality	2		—
Other	4		15
Total	99(a)		100

(a) Total not equal to 100 due to rounding.

When asked how satisfied they were with their house, 85% of the permanent residents said they were satisfied; 15% said they were dissatisfied. Only 5% of the seasonal residents indicated dissatisfaction with their house.

However, a definite pattern of satisfaction emerged when respondents were asked about specific features of their homes. Respondents seemed satisfied with the "cooking facilities" in their house and the "lighting." "Parking facilities," "plumbing" and "heating" rated almost as high. The percentages of satisfied respondents appear in Table 30.

TABLE 30. Satisfaction with household facilities, Hayes Township, 1973

	% satisfied or very satisfied	
	Permanent residents	Seasonal residents
Lighting	96	91
Cooking facilities	96	92
Parking facilities	95	92
Plumbing	94	86
Heating	92	88
Amount of noise	91	92
Time spent cleaning	86	93
Inside storage	86	57
Floor plan	86	88
Number of rooms	81	82
Number of bedrooms	73	54
Outside storage	70	68

The respondents were most dissatisfied with "inside and outside storage facilities," and with the "number of bedrooms." When asked how many more bedrooms they would like, 23% wanted one more, 6% wanted two more, and 2% wanted three or four more. Over 10% of those surveyed also said they were dissatisfied with the "number of rooms" in the house, the "floor plan," and the "time spent cleaning."

The satisfaction with certain features in a house may be related to the factors considered important in choosing a house. The respondents were asked to rate a list of such factors on a scale from very unimportant to very important to them in choosing a house. Results indicate many people consider the outdoors, the environment around the house, very important (Table 31). This is consistent with the evidence in Table 29, listing features which initially attracted the respondents to their home.

About half or more of the people questioned felt all features mentioned in the survey were important or very important. Choosing a "house near nice neighbors" was most important, followed by a house with "plenty of room for outdoor activities," a "house where friends can be entertained," and a "house in the open country." Fewer people sought a "house with possibilities for fixing up," a "house remote from neighbors," and a "house near a lake or a stream." Since only 42% of the permanent residents did not consider "remoteness from neighbors" important, about 16% who did must have felt "being near nice neighbors" was important.

If only those items rated very important are considered, the ranking of features changes dramatically among both groups. With one revealing exception, the changes in the rank follow a similar pattern. "Being near nice neighbors" drops from first to fourth or fifth, "room for outdoor activities" remains in second place, and a feature of the environment moves from fourth to

TABLE 31. Features important in choosing a house, Hayes Township, 1973

	%		Rank	
Permanent residents	Important or very important (A)	Very important (B)	from (A)	from (B)
House near nice neighbors	91	13	1	5
Plenty of room for outdoor activities	88	21	2	2
House where one can entertain friends	80	11	3	6
House in open country	76	27	4	1
House with possibilities for fixing up	62	8	5	7
House remote from neighbors	58	18	6	3
House near lake or stream	49	13	7	4
Seasonal Residents				
House near nice neighbors	98	15	1	4
Plenty of room for outdoor activities	92	27	2	2
House where one can entertain friends	84	11	3	5
House near lake or stream	74	35	4	1
House with possibilities for fixing up	71	3	5	7
House with open country	61	23	6	3
House remote from neighbors	42	4	7	6

first. More permanent residents preferred a "house in the open country" remote from neighbors, while seasonal residents are more attracted to the dense neighborhood of a lake or stream property than to the solitude of open country.

Satisfaction with Neighborhood and Community

The neighborhood and community are important factors in selecting a residence (Table 31). The atmosphere and facilities they provide are also important factors in a person's satisfaction with the place he lives.

When asked how they felt about their neighborhood as a place to live, 90 to 95% of both permanent and seasonal residents said they liked their neighborhood and liked living on the road their house was on. We asked people if they would prefer to stay in their house, move to a different house in the same neighborhood, or move to a different neighborhood. Only 14% of the permanent residents expressed a desire to move to a different neighborhood, 11% preferred to move within the same neighborhood, and 75% did not wish to move. Those wanting to move would overwhelmingly choose a rural country area. Very few in this rural community wanted to live in the city or close to it.

The respondents were asked what specific features they liked or disliked about their neighborhoods. The most common responses were favorable feelings about the natural beauty, and then the neighbors. Commonly mentioned disliked features included: traffic, neighborhood children, and location to work or shopping.

Community Services

Questions were also asked about the township residents' satisfaction with community services (Table 32). They replied on a 5-point scale from "very dissatisfied" to "very satisfied." Nearly half of both groups of residents were dissatisfied with road conditions. Permanent residents were also dissatisfied with public medical facilities, ambulance service and police protection. Seasonal residents were concerned with garbage and trash pick-up.

TABLE 32. Satisfaction with community services, Hayes Township, 1973

	%		
Permanent residents	Dissatisfied or very dissatisfied	No opinion	Satisfied or very satisfied
Condition of roads	55	0	45
Public medical facilities	24	37	39
Ambulance	22	46	32
Police protection	19	11	70
Kinds of fuel available	14	3	83
Fire protection	10	29	61
Community recreation facilities	10	22	68
Garbage and trash pickup	8	13	79
Utility services	3	0	94
Public school facilities	1	37	56
Library services	2	33	65
Seasonal residents			
Condition of roads	45	2	53
Garbage and trash pickup	21	26	52
Police protection	21	31	47
Kinds of fuel available	16	7	77
Public medical facilities	16	65	19
Ambulance	13	74	13
Fire protection	12	62	26
Community recreation facilities	6	52	42
Utility services	4	2	94
Library services	—	84	16

Since local budget constraints limit the services the townships can provide, respondents were asked to identify high priority services for improvement. Seventy-one percent of both groups of respondents mentioned at least one service that should be improved. Fewer listed two or three different priorities. However, community services in general were often mentioned as of high priority (Table 33).

Community Contact and Participation

The amount of contact people have with their community can be indexed by the extent to which they shop in the community and attend its organizations. We asked respondents to name the town where they purchased specific items. Responses are ranked in Table 34 according to the percent of permanent residents purchasing items in Harrison, the center of Hayes Township.

For often-purchased items, such as food, drugs, and household and hardware items, most people went to

TABLE 33. Priorities for community service improvement, Hayes Township, 1973

	% listing services	
	Permanent residents	Seasonal residents
Roads	43	35
Medical facilities	25	16
General community services	24	23
Ambulance service	13	5
Police protection	12	20
Garbage and trash pickup	6	30
Fire protection	5	8

TABLE 34. Community where permanent residents purchased goods and services, Hayes Township, 1973

	%		
	Harrison	Other in Clare Co.	Different Co.
Food	91	5	4
Houseware and household	83	5	11
Medicine and drugs	70	5	25
Auto service	62	21	16
Doctor	43	10	46
Dentist	39	30	28
Furniture and appliances	34	24	41
Clothing	23	8	68
Auto sales	10	33	55

Harrison. For those purchased relatively infrequently (clothing, furniture, appliances and autos), respondents often traveled further away. The high percentage of persons seeking medical and dental services outside the county and even beyond an adjacent county underscores the expressed dissatisfaction with these community services.

The permanent residents were asked to describe their participation in community groups and activities. Participation in at least one organization was mentioned by 48% of the sample while 52% did not mention any organizations. At least two organizations were mentioned by 27% of the sample, and at least three by 10%. Seventy-eight percent of the organizations mentioned were located in Harrison and 11% in Clare and Gladwin.

The wife in the family attended 40% of the organizations cited, the husband alone was the member of 25%, and husband and wife together attended 25%. Children attended less than 8% of the organizations and the family as a group only 1%.

Impacts of Immigration on the Attitudes and Values of Hayes Township Residents

Preceding sections of this report document the situations of permanent and seasonal residents at the time of the survey. The most dramatic impacts reflect

changes in the numbers of inhabitants, from 606 people in 1960 to 1,942 in 1970, and an estimated 2,794 at the end of 1973 (based on study results). The fact that four to five times as many people live in the community, patronize its businesses and attend its organizations, use its roads and facilities and vote in its elections as did 13 yr earlier, is most significant in understanding how the character of Hayes Township has changed.

However, members of the community and persons from communities anticipating similar growth wish to know if the values, attitudes and lifestyles of the residents have changed as a result of immigration. A complete answer to the question is not available. Migration flows both in and out, and we cannot consult the people who left Hayes Township between 1960 and 1973 to find out what their attitudes would be if they had stayed. Natural increase in the Clare Co. population was only 9% between 1960 and 1970 (special census tabulation). The county experienced a net out-migration of 16% for people between the ages of 20 and 29, and a net in-migration of 96% for persons between the ages of 60 and 69 (special census tabulation).

However, we can compare responses of Clare Co. natives currently in the township to those of immigrants to see what differences exist between them. Four groups of residents were identified for this purpose:

- Natives, those who had always lived in Clare Co.
- Old immigrants, those who moved into Hayes Township in 1971 or earlier;
- New immigrants, those who moved into Hayes Township after 1971;
- Seasonal residents, those who spend part of the year in the township but claim residence elsewhere.

Natives of Clare Co. were 10.5% of the sample households, old immigrants were 48.7% and new immigrants since 1971 were 40.7%. The old immigrants represented 23.2% that arrived before 1968 and 25.5% arriving from 1968 through 1971.

The natives are much younger than the rest of the population, have more formal education, higher incomes and a more rural background than the immigrants. They are more diverse as a group and have the largest proportion of both one person households and households of four or more persons. The natives are also more likely to say they have to go without or that they are well off compared to the rest of the permanent residents. A distribution of the age, education and re-

irement status of three groups of permanent resident families is presented in Table 35. Ninety percent of the native household heads were under 50, 84% were under 35; 73% of the old immigrants were over 50 while only 42% of the new immigrant heads had reached that age.

TABLE 35. Age, employment and education of permanent residents, Hayes Township, 1973

	(% of distribution)		Old	New
	Total	Natives of Clare Co.	migrants before 1971	migrants 1972-73
% of total sample	100	10.5	48.7	40.7
Age of head total	100	100	100	100
less than 50 yr	46	90	27	58
50 yr or older	54	10	73	42
Head is retired	47	8	56	40
Head's educational attainment	100	100	100	100
more than 12 yr	16	30	10	14
12 yr	33	52	22	43
less than 12 yr	51	18	68	43
High school completion by age of head (%)				
12 yr or more	49	82	32	57
Head less than 50 yr	72	87	72	65
Head 50 yr or older	27	33	18	45

Only 8% of the native heads were retired compared to 50% of the old immigrant heads and 40% of the new immigrant heads. For those old immigrants who had come to Hayes Township before 1968, 40% were retired in 1973 compared to 70% of those who came between 1968 and 1971. Old immigrants had a much lower level of education than did the other groups; only 32% had completed high school compared to 82% of the natives and 57% of the new immigrants. When this relationship was examined for those under 50 and those 50 yr old and over, the magnitude of the difference between groups was reduced but a substantial differential still persisted.

A distribution of annual family income and perceived income adequacy for permanent and seasonal residents is presented in Table 36. Old immigrants had the lowest incomes and were most likely to say that they could just manage or had to do without on their incomes. For old immigrants arriving between 1968 and 1971, only 5% reported incomes over \$10,000 and 86% claimed they just managed or did without. Nevertheless, more natives said they did without necessities. Seasonal residents reported higher incomes and high levels of income adequacy, not unexpected from a group that maintains a second home.

The natives sampled were less satisfied with most community services than were immigrant groups and more demanding of increased or better service. The notable exception was the area of police protection. Only 4% of the natives expressed dissatisfaction with the level of police protection while 21% of all other groups were dissatisfied. Old immigrants show the weakest linkage between level of dissatisfaction and desired improvements; natives show the strongest cor-

respondence between the percent dissatisfied and the percent desiring improvement (Table 37).

The higher dissatisfaction of natives with fire protection might reflect the fact that 50% of them live in the open country while all but 15% of the other groups live in sub-divisions closer to Harrison. However, this difference does not transfer to greater dissatisfaction with road conditions among natives. Still, natives support road improvements more than other groups. For all immigrants and seasonal residents, there appears a direct relationship between length or extent of contact with the community and the expression of no opinion concerning the level of services.

TABLE 36. Income and income adequacy, Hayes Township, 1973

	Total	Permanent residents Natives	Old migrants	New migrants	Seasonal residents
Income for those reporting	100	100	100	100	100
under \$5000	36	16	55	19	9
\$5000-9999	33	24	34	34	22
\$10,000 or more	31	60	11	47	69
Feelings of wealth	100	100	100	100	100
go without	10	23	12	6	2
just manage	64	36	71	61	46
well off or very well off	26	41	17	33	52

TABLE 37. Satisfaction with community service by length of residence, Hayes Township, 1973

	Total	Permanent residents Natives	Old migrants	New migrants	Seasonal residents
Police protection	100	100	100	100	100
dissatisfied	19	4	21	21	21
no opinion	11	0	10	14	31
satisfied	70	96	69	65	47
Ambulance service	100	100	100	100	100
dissatisfied	22	36	31	5	13
no opinion	46	42	35	60	74
satisfied	32	22	34	32	13
Fire protection	100	100	100	100	100
dissatisfied	10	28	14	2	12
no opinion	29	17	16	47	62
satisfied	61	55	70	51	26
Road conditions	100	100	100	100	100
dissatisfied	55	55	62	46	45
no opinion	0	0	1	0	2
satisfied	45	45	37	54	53
Percent desiring more or better service					
Police protection	12	3	15	10	20
Ambulance service	13	24	17	3	5
Fire protection	5	28	4	0	8
Roads	43	54	35	49	35
Medical facilities	25	34	27	22	16
Community services	24	32	27	13	23

The natives differ from the rest of the community in attitude toward public policy measures affecting water quality, land use and population growth (Table 38). More than other groups, natives favored education and incentives as a means of gaining cooperation in preserving lake quality. They were the lowest in their

endorsement of regulations on minimum home values in some areas and the general need for land use planning in Hayes Township.

TABLE 38. Land use and community growth policy preferences by immigrant and resident status.

	Total	Native	Permanent residents Old migrants before 1966	1966-1971	New migrants	Seasonal residents
				%		
% of total	100	10.5	23.2	25.5	40.7	100
Method judged more effective in protecting lake quality	100	100	100	100	100	100
Education and incentives	35	50	30	24	42	31
Laws and controls	35	50	70	76	58	69
				% YES		
Minimum house value in some areas	63	52	61	74	68	72
Should community take steps to encourage migration:						
to Hayes Township	28	23	25	25	37	24
to Clare Co.	34	27	31	43	44	23
Should community take steps to discourage migration:						
to Hayes Township	12	20	19	8	9	18
to Clare Co.	11	20	18	8	8	16

Perhaps natives with more rural backgrounds and values are likely to be more opposed to controls. However, the lower age and higher educational level of the natives may predispose them to favor educational methods. When the permanent resident sample was divided into families with household heads under 50 yr and those with heads aged 50 and over, 53% of those under age 50 preferred laws and controls to education and incentives as a means of preserving lake quality while 76% of those over 50 preferred laws and controls.

Most respondents opposed community actions to encourage or discourage further migration to Hayes Township and Clare Co. All permanent resident groups favor additional growth in the county rather than in the township. The highest level of endorsement for any community actions to affect growth rates came from the most recent immigrants. Forty-four percent of the respondents moving in since 1971 felt the community should encourage migration to Clare Co.; 37% felt migration to Hayes Township should be encouraged. Natives and seasonal residents were most opposed to encouraging migration and most in favor of discouraging migration. For the others, support for policies to encourage growth was directly and strongly related to the short length of their residence in Hayes Township.

It is unlikely that very recent immigrants could endorse a deliberate policy of no growth without questioning the desirability of their own recent move. This impression is strengthened by comparing the responses of seasonal residents who planned to move to Clare Co. within 5 yr with the responses of those who did

not. Nearly half (45%) of those planning to move to the county indicated the community should encourage migration to Hayes Township; only 22% of those not planning to immigrate gave this answer.

The attitudes and policy preferences of natives, immigrants and seasonal residents, therefore, do not suggest that immigration has drastically changed the value and attitude mix of the community. Many immigrants reported substantial contact with the area before moving there. They had relatives, spouses or friends from the area or they had vacationed and visited there. These people had some opportunity to know the community and judge the compatibility of the residents before moving to Hayes Township. Such circumstances can foster growth of a relatively homogeneous population such as that in Hayes Township.

Observable differences in attitudes can be attributed to changes in age composition and educational level of the population that immigration has produced. There is no support for the hypothesis that new residents respond in terms of higher standards of performance more appropriate to urban areas. The township population simply grew more rapidly than did public institutions and services required by such a population. Since half of the household heads surveyed are of retirement age, a different mix of community services are required. And, it is harder for these people to pay the taxes to support needed services.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

A review of the 1970 census data for Clare Co., Hayes Township and the city of Harrison showed that all three experienced substantial immigration between 1960 and 1970. Hayes Township showed the greatest residential instability during this period receiving 20% of all the migrants to the county. A building boom of inexpensive housing from 1960 to 1964 was a strong pull factor influencing the township's rapid population growth in 1965 and 1966. The census practice of reporting housing quality measures for all year-round housing (occupied and vacant) substantially understated the quality of housing enjoyed by permanent residents of Hayes Township.

Only 10% of the permanent residents surveyed were born in Clare Co. Township residents were diverse in terms of residential backgrounds, age and educational attainment. Nearly half of the household heads were retired.

Just over 10% of the permanent residents said their income was inadequate to provide for necessities and 25% reported difficulty finding work in the previous 5 yr. By contrast, 2% of the seasonal residents reported inadequate incomes or trouble finding work.

Many features of the respondent's dwellings were reviewed, but there was little evidence of major housing deficiencies. Few expressed dissatisfaction with their housing. Two thirds of the permanent residents had made a major improvement in their home since its purchase. This is a substantial contribution to upgrading community housing. Much of this upgrading has been done by families who have converted a seasonal to a permanent home.

While the housing of seasonal residents showed serious deficiencies for year-round living, those families intending to migrate to Clare Co. either had good quality houses or they planned a major improvement to make them so.

Most permanent residents came to Hayes Township because of community ties to friends or family, as well as a strong attraction to the area's natural environment. They are basically satisfied with the housing and the community. They advocate governmental actions to preserve environmental quality, but feel local government should be neutral in promoting community growth.

This study was initiated to determine whether numerous immigrants were residing in substandard, formerly seasonal homes, and living under deficient housing conditions. Support for this hypothesis came from published census reports of 29% substandard housing in Clare Co. and from knowledgeable county administrators.

Three types of evidence were reported in this study that undermine this hypothesis. First, the township and the city of Harrison show much lower rates of substandard housing when vacant housing for occasional use is disaggregated from occupied year-round housing in unpublished census tables. Second, the permanent residents surveyed showed a low incidence of major housing deficiencies. Only 2% lacked bathrooms and flush toilets, and 4% did not have water piped into the house. While about 30% lacked conventional centralized heating, less than 8% were dissatisfied with their heating. Families expressed most dissatisfaction with inside storage space and with the number of bedrooms, but only 22% showed more than one person per room and only 7% more than 1.5 persons per room. Less than 1% lacked complete cooking facilities and only 4% expressed dissatisfaction with the facilities.

Third, former seasonal residents have invested a large amount in improving their homes. Improvements by residents averaged \$7,342 per family, an amount greater than one-half the value of the median priced permanent residence in the township. Seasonal residents planning to move to their current vacation homes

also have substantially better housing to move into than the average of all seasonal residents.

This evidence conflicts with the expectations that the conversion of seasonal to permanent residence by a retirement age population has seriously degraded the average housing quality enjoyed by families in the township. Instead, the opening of Interstate 27-75 in the early sixties and the subsequent building boom in both seasonal and permanent dwellings acted as pull factors complementing migration push factors. Because of less efficient use of space, converting a summer home to winter use is usually more expensive than building a year-round dwelling. A community building policy that required all lot sizes and structures to meet standards appropriate for year-round occupancy would help insure higher quality housing and avoid crowding small cottages on tiny lots.

The conversion of summer cabins to year-round use is more expensive than building year-round dwellings of standard size and quality. Lot sizes and setback restrictions that seem appropriate for vacation home developments can result in neighborhoods of tiny cottages packed too closely together when converted to permanent use. This has been the case in Hayes Township. If the township since the 1950's had required seasonal home development to meet land use and building standards appropriate to neighborhoods of permanent residence, these crowded conditions could have been avoided. The housing, in all probability, would now be of higher quality and the total cost to the homeowners could have been lowered. However, such policies would have denied hundreds of families opportunities for inexpensive vacation residences.

Such families have spread their housing investments over many years so that while the total expenditure for standard quality dwellings may have been higher, the expense was affordable because it occurred in small amounts. Families were also able to better use their own labor in this gradual conversion process.

Communities must balance their priorities in the interest of equitable growth. Perhaps firm controls on minimum lot size, plumbing and septic systems together with provisions for future central heating and insulation should be required of all vacation dwellings. But more stringent standards can only keep out the moderate income people who have contributed to economic growth in places such as Hayes Township.

Many Michigan families want to move to the country. Preservation of a desirable quality of life is more likely to result from well planned community development than from a policy of just letting development happen. But if all rural Michigan communities set out to attract only the wealthy, many will not grow at all.

REFERENCES

1. Beal, Calvin L. (1975). The revival of population growth in non-metropolitan America. Econ. Devel. Div., Econ. Res. Serv., U.S. Dept. of Agr., ERS-GOS. June.
2. Beegle, J. Allan (1971). Population growth and redistribution. Mich. Agr. Expt. Sta. Res. Rep. 150. 12 pp.
3. El Shawaf, Salama Ahmed (1976). Planned land use contributions to population redistribution and community development: The application of mid-Michigan model to land development policy in Egypt. Thesis for degree of Ph. D. Michigan State Univ., E. Lansing 48824.
4. Fuguitt, Glen V., and James J. Zuiches (1975). Residential preferences and population distribution. *Demography* 12(3): 491-504. August.
5. Koebernick, Tom, and J. Allan Beegle (1978). Migration of the elderly to rural areas: A case study in Michigan. In J. Allan Beegle and Robert McNamara (eds.), *Patterns of Migration and Population Change in America's Heartland*. Mich. Agr. Expt. Sta. Res. Rep. 344 (also North Central Rep. Res. Pub. 238). 104 pp.
6. Michigan State University, Mich. Dept. of Comm. and Exec. Off. of the Governor. *County and Regional Facts* N.D.
7. Morris, Earl W.; Margaret E. Woods, and Alvin L. Jacobson (1972). The measurement of housing quality. *Land Economics*. 48:383-387. November.
8. O'Hare, William; J. Allan Beegle, and Jim Leonard (1977). Michigan population: Growth and distribution changes. Mich. Agr. Expt. Sta. Res. Rep. 331. 12 pp. 145. 12 pp.
9. Perkinson, L. (1971). Population distribution in non-metropolitan Michigan. Mich. Agr. Expt. Sta. Res. Rep. 145. 12 pp.
10. U. S. Census (1970). Fourth Count Housing Summary.
11. U. S. Census (1970). Fourth Count Population Summary.